



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS, LLC  
986 BEDFORD STREET  
STAMFORD CT 06905-5619

**COPY MAILED**

NOV 09 2007

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
Hans-Wulf Pfeiffer  
Application No. 09/929,267  
Filed: August 14, 2001  
Attorney Docket No. 03466-P0001B

**DECISION GRANTING PETITION**

This is a decision on the renewed petition filed October 15, 2007, under 37 CFR 1.137 (b), to revive the above-identified application.

The petition under 37 CFR 1.137 (b) is **GRANTED**.

The above-identified application became abandoned as a result of petitioner's failure to file a proper appeal brief within the time period provided in 37 CFR 1.192(a). A Notice of Appeal was filed July 18, 2005. On July 1, 2005, an appeal brief was filed. On August 25, 2005, a Notification of Non-Compliance with 37 CFR 1.192 (c) was mailed. In response, a Supplemental Appeal Brief was filed October 27, 2005. On December 13, 2005 a second Notification of Non-Compliance with 37 CFR 1.192 (c) was mailed and in response another Appeal Brief was filed on December 27, 2005. A third Notification of Non-Compliance with 37 CFR 1.192 (c) was mailed on February 15, 2006. No response having been filed, this application became abandoned and in response to the abandonment, a petition to revive and Substitute Appeal Brief were filed. The petition was granted on May 22, 2006 however, a Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief was mailed June 7, 2006. The Substitute Appeal Brief filed July 10, 2006, in response thereof, was followed by yet another Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief on September 13, 2006. After the filing of a Substitute Appeal Brief and extension of time on October 6, 2006, A Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief was mailed January 8, 2007. No response having been timely filed, the application became abandoned.

A petition to revive filed March 23, 2007 was dismissed in a corrected decision mailed September 20, 2007 because the Examiner of record indicated that the Substitute Appeal Brief filed March 23, 2007 was not in compliance with 37 CFR 41.317(c)(1)(ix).

Comes now petitioner with the instant renewed petition to revive and a Substitute Appeal Brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The Examiner of record has indicated that the Appeal Brief submitted October 15, 2007 with the instant renewed petition is acceptable.

This application is being forwarded to Technology Center 1731 for review of the Appeal Brief filed October 15, 2007.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned Petitions Attorney at (571) 272-3212.

*Patricia Faison-Ball*

Patricia Faison-Ball  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions